

### REMARKS

In response to the final office action mailed on March 4, 2010 ("Final Office Action"), Applicants have amended claims 1, 27, and 31. Support for the amendment can be found, e.g., in FIGs. 1-4 of the present application. No new matter has been introduced by the above amendments. Claims 1-4, 6, 14-21, 24-27, and 31 are presented for examination.

Initially, Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the telephone conference with their counsel on May 14, 2010. During the interview, the patentability of independent claims 1, 27, and 31 was discussed in view of the prior art cited in the Final Office Action. During the telephone conference, Applicants proposed to replace the phrase "the pressure controller being disposed within the high-pressure chamber" recited in claim 1 with "the pressure controller being entirely disposed within the high-pressure chamber" and proposed making the same amendment to the similar phrases recited in claims 27 and 31. The Examiner agreed that this amendment would overcome the prior art cited in the Final Office Action and asked Applicants to prepare a written response to present this amendment. Other points discussed during the conference are summarized below.

Claims 1-4, 6, 14-21, 24, 26, 27, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richter, et al., DE 42 41 074 ("Richter") in view of Van't Hoff, U.S. Patent No. 6,616,017 ("Van't Hoff") or Couffer, U.S. Patent No. 3,228,559 ("Couffer"). Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richter in view of Van't Hoff or Couffer, and further in view of Lippman et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,423,454 ("Lippman").

Independent claim 1 is discussed first. Claim 1, as amended, recites a pressure package system that includes a pressure controller entirely disposed within a high-pressure chamber.

In the response filed on January 20, 2010, Applicants pointed out that none of the four cited references discloses or renders obvious a system in which a pressure controller is disposed within the high pressure chamber. *See* page 13, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraphs and page 16, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner does not dispute the above statements but asserts that "[t]he claims do not define whether or not the entire pressure controller is in the high pressure chamber and Richter does dispose the upper portion of the pressure controller in the high pressure chamber as claimed." *See* page, last paragraph; emphasis added. Applicants do not necessarily agree with the Examiner's assertion. However, in the sole interest of moving this

application toward allowance, Applicants have amended claim 1 to make it clear that the system of claim 1 includes a pressure controller entirely disposed within a high pressure chamber. None of the cited references discloses or renders obvious such a system. As noted above, during the telephone conference on May 14, 2010, the Examiner agreed that claim 1, as amended, would be patentable over the cited references.

Thus, claim 1 is not obvious over Richter in view of Van't Hoff, Couffer, and Lippman. Nor are claims 2-4, 6, 14-21, and 24-26, all of which depend from claim 1.

Applicants turn now to independent claims 27 and 31. These two claims, as amended, are not obvious over Richter in view of Van't Hoff, Couffer, and Lippman for at least the same reasons set forth above.

Accordingly, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

Applicants submit that the application is now in condition for allowance, an action of which is requested.

Any circumstance in which Applicants have: (a) addressed certain comments of the Examiner does not mean that Applicants concede other comments of the Examiner; (b) made arguments for the patentability of some claims does not mean that there are not other good reasons for the patentability of those claims and other claims; or (c) amended or canceled a claim does not mean that Applicants concede any of the Examiner's positions with respect to that claim or other claims.

Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050, referencing Attorney's Docket No. 25943-0004US1.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 21, 2010

/Tony Zhang/  
Tony Zhang, Ph.D.  
Reg. No. L0256

Customer Number 26161  
Fish & Richardson P.C.  
Telephone: (212) 765-5070  
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945  
30539245.doc